

### REMARKS

Claims 1–29 and 54 were pending. Claims 17–21 and 54 were allowed. Claims 1, 3–16, 22–25, and 27–29 were rejected. Claims 2 and 26 were objected to. Claims 2, 5, 7–8, 10–11, 13–14, 16–17, 19, 21, and 54 are amended. Claims 1, 3–4, 6, 9, 15, 18, 20, and 22–29 are cancelled. (Claims 30–53 were previously cancelled.) New claims 55–72 are presented. Therefore, claims 2, 5, 7–8, 10–14, 16–17, 19, 21, and 54–72 remain pending. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3–16, 22–25, and 27–29 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious. Applicants respond to these rejections as set forth below.

##### *Claims 1, 3–9, and 11–16*

Claims 1, 3–9, and 11–16 were rejected as obvious over U.S. Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0208589 to Yamamoto et al. (“Yamamoto”) in view of “An Access Based Clustering Protocol for Multi-hop Wireless Ad hoc Networks” by Hou et al. (“Hou”). Claim 2, which depended from claim 1 was objected to as dependent upon a rejected base claim but otherwise allowable. Claims 1, 3–4, 6, 9, and 15 have been cancelled, claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form, and claims 5, 7–8, 10–14, and 16 have been amended as necessary to depend, either directly or indirectly from claim 2. Therefore, claims 2, 5, 7–8, 10–14, and 16 are now allowable. Withdrawal of the rejections of and objections to these claims is therefore requested.

##### *Claims 25 and 27–29*

Claims 25 and 27–29 were also rejected as obvious over Yamamoto in view of Hou. Claims 25 and 27–29 have been cancelled. The rejection of these claims is therefore moot.

##### *Claims 10 and 22–24*

Claims 10 and 22–24 were rejected as obvious over Yamamoto in view of Hou in further view of U.S. Patent 7,457,279 to Scott et al. (“Scott”). As noted above, claim 10 has been amended to depend from claim 2, which is allowable over the cited art. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore requested. Claims 22–24 have been cancelled, rendering their rejection moot.

### **Allowable Subject Matter and New Claims**

Claims 17–21 and 54 were allowed. Claims 2 and 26 were objected to as allowable but dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form, and claim 26 has been cancelled. New claims 55–72 are presented, each of which depends from one of the claims previously indicated to be allowable. Additionally, various amendments have been made to the claims to delete unnecessary verbiage. None of these amendments are believed to affect Examiner's view of the allowability of these claims.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are now in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowability is therefore requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

**December 22, 2009**

Date

**/Billy C. Allen III/**

Billy C. Allen III

Reg. No. 46,147

**WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH,  
RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI, L.L.P.**  
20333 State Highway 249, Suite 600  
Houston, TX 77070

832/446-2400

832/446-2424 (facsimile)

832/446-2409 (direct)